



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/570,909	03/29/2006	Carsten Hopf	50125/147001	1220
21559	7590	11/29/2009		
CLARK & ELBING LLP 101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER HILL, KEVIN KAI	
			ART UNIT 1633	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/20/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentadministrator@clarkelbing.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/570,909	HOPF, CARSTEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KEVIN K. HILL	1633	

All Participants:

(1) KEVIN K. HILL, USPTO.

(2) Kristina Bieker-Brady, Applicant's representative.

Date of Interview: 12 November 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims 7, 9-10 and 69-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims discussed:

Claims 7, 71, 72, 76

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

/Kevin K. Hill/
Examiner, Art Unit 1633

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The breadth of "modulating" embraces compounds that activate gamma secretase activity to reduce Abeta-42 formation; however, the specification only supports decreased FADS2 activity that consequently inhibits γ -secretase activity and thereby achieving a reduction in the production of Abeta-42. While Czirr et al (2008) teach the use of compounds affecting γ -secretase activity to reduce the production of Abeta-42 peptides, Czirr et al do not teach the compounds to stimulate or increase γ -secretase activity to achieve the reduced production of Abeta-42. To advance prosecution, the Examiner proposed cancellation of the claims drawn to "modulating".

The Examiner proposed adding the phrase "enzymatically active" before "fatty acid delta-6 desaturase" to clarify that the FADS2 has biological activity, and thus the claims, e.g. Claim 76, do not read upon enzymatically inactive fragments.

In a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative on November 17, 2009, Applicant's representative requested the Examiner refrain from acting on the next Office Action until December 1, 2009 so as to allow Applicant, who is/are foreign inventors, time to respond to the proposed amendments. The Examiner has agreed to do so, and expects a response from Applicant by December 1, 2009. Applicant's representative also requested whether the phrase "functionally active" may be used instead of "enzymatically active", as per [0015, 0018 and 0020] of the published application. Upon review of the definitions provided in the specification, e.g. functionally active includes enzymatically active [0018], the Examiner agrees that the phrase "functionally active" is a sufficient replacement of "enzymatically active".